

SUPERSYMMETRY PHENOMENOLOGY*

V. Barger^a and R.J.N. Phillips^b^a*Physics Department, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA*^b*Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX, UK***Abstract**

We review some recent results and future prospects in the phenomenology of Supersymmetry. We discuss the searches for superpartner states, the searches for Higgs bosons in the minimal SUSY model, and additional parameter constraints arising in SUSY-GUT models.

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry (SUSY) is a vital element in present thinking about fundamental particle physics. At this Conference it certainly needs no formal introduction nor motivation; we simply emphasise here two important aspects — it has perturbatively calculable consequences and can be experimentally tested. This talk will be about the associated phenomenology.

Experimental evidence for SUSY could come in various forms, such as

- (a) discovery of one or more superpartners,
- (b) discovery of a neutral Higgs boson with non-standard properties and/or a charged Higgs boson,
- (c) discovery of $p \rightarrow K\nu$ decay,
- (d) discovery that dark matter consists of heavy neutral particles.

This talk will address areas (a) and (b) above. We shall discuss the present status and future prospects of searches for superpartner particles, searches for Higgs bosons in the minimal SUSY model (MSSM) and additional parameter constraints that come from SUSY-GUT studies. We leave other phenomenological topics like proton decay, dark matter, R -parity breaking, etc., to other speakers.

*Talk presented by V. Barger at the *HARC SUSY Workshop*, Texas, April 1993

2 Experimental SUSY Signatures

The MSSM conserves a multiplicative R -parity: $R_p = (-1)^{2S+L+3B}$, where S , L , B are spin, lepton number, baryon number. Standard Model (SM) particles have $R = 1$; their superpartners have $R = -1$. Hence heavy sparticles must decay to lighter sparticles, while the lightest sparticle (LSP) is stable. If the LSP has no strong or electromagnetic interactions, as seems likely since it has defied detection for so long, it will carry away “missing” energy and momentum — a vital SUSY signature. The LSP will also be a candidate for cosmological dark matter; this focuses extra interest on the R_p -conserving case.

Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) are essential for SUSY phenomenology to economize parameters. A minimal set of GUT parameters with soft SUSY breaking consists of the gauge and Yukawa couplings g_i and λ_i , the Higgs mixing mass μ , the common gaugino mass at the GUT scale $m_{1/2}$, the common scalar mass at the GUT scale m_0 , and two parameters A, B that give trilinear and bilinear scalar couplings. At the weak scale, the gauge couplings are experimentally determined. The Higgs potential depends upon m_0, μ, B (at tree level) and $m_{1/2}, A, \lambda_t, \lambda_b$ (at one loop). After minimizing the Higgs potential and putting in the measured Z and fermion masses, there remain 5 independent parameters, e.g. $m_t, \tan \beta, m_0, m_{1/2}, A$.

Beside the SM gauge bosons and fermions, the MSSM spectrum contains Higgs bosons ($h, H, A, H^\pm$), gluinos ($\tilde{g}$), squarks ($\tilde{q}$), sleptons ($\tilde{\ell}^\pm$), charginos ($\tilde{W}_i^\pm, i = 1, 2$; mixtures of winos and charged higgsinos), neutralinos ($\tilde{Z}_j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$; mixtures of zinos, photinos and neutral higgsinos). An alternate notation is $\tilde{\chi}_i^\pm$ for $\tilde{W}_i^\pm$ and $\tilde{\chi}_j^0$ for $\tilde{Z}_j$. Figure 1 illustrates the evolution of the SUSY mass spectrum from the GUT scale.^{1,2} The running masses are plotted versus μ and the physical value occurs approximately where the running mass $m = m(\mu)$ intersects the curve $m = \mu$. For the Higgs scalar H_2 , the mass-square becomes negative at low μ due to coupling to top; in this region we have actually plotted $-|m(\mu)|$. Negative mass-square parameter is essential for spontaneous symmetry-breaking; here it is achieved by radiative effects. The running masses for the gauginos $\tilde{g}, \tilde{W}, \tilde{B}$ are given by

$$M_i(\mu) = m_{1/2} \frac{\alpha_i(\mu)}{\alpha_i(M_G)}, \quad (1)$$

where i labels the gauge symmetry; this applies before mixing with higgsinos to obtain the chargino and neutralino mass eigenstates. In Fig. 1 the squarks are heavier than the gluinos, but the opposite ordering $m_{\tilde{q}} < m_{\tilde{g}}$ is possible in other scenarios. Sleptons, neutralinos and charginos are lighter than squarks and gluinos in general. The usual soft SUSY-breaking mechanisms preserve the gauge coupling relations (unification) at M_G .

In order that SUSY cancellations shall take effect at low mass scales as required, the SUSY mass parameters are expected to be bounded by

$$m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{q}}, |\mu|, m_A \lesssim 1\text{--}2 \text{ TeV}. \quad (2)$$

Fig. 1. Typical RGE results for spartner masses.¹

The other parameter $\tan \beta$ is effectively bounded by

$$1 \lesssim \tan \beta \lesssim 65, \quad (3)$$

where the lower bound arises from consistency in GUT models and the upper bound is a perturbative limit (following Ref. 3). Proton decay gives $\tan \beta < 85$.^{4,5}

At LEP I, sufficiently light SUSY particles would be produced through their gauge couplings to the Z . Direct searches for SUSY particles at LEP give

$$m_{\tilde{q}}, m_{\tilde{\ell}}, m_{\tilde{\nu}}, m_{\tilde{W}_1} \gtrsim 40\text{--}45 \text{ GeV}. \quad (4)$$

There are also indirect limits on Z decays to SUSY particles,⁶

$$\Delta\Gamma_Z(\text{SUSY}) < 25 \text{ MeV}, \quad (5)$$

$$\Gamma(Z \rightarrow \tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_1 : \text{invisible}) < 17 \text{ MeV}, \quad (6)$$

$$B(Z \rightarrow \tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_1) < \text{few} \times 10^{-5}. \quad (7)$$

It is convenient to express the excluded regions in terms of the parameters that determine the gaugino masses, i.e. in the $(\mu, m_{1/2})$ or $(\mu, m_{\tilde{g}})$ plane: see Fig. 2.

Hadron colliders can explore much higher energy ranges, producing squarks and gluinos strongly. At the Tevatron, with luminosity 25 pb^{-1} expected in 1993, about 100 events would be expected for each of the channels $\tilde{g}\tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{q}\tilde{q}$ for $m_{\tilde{q}} \sim m_{\tilde{g}} \sim 200 \text{ GeV}$, reaching well beyond the LEP range.^{6,7,8}

SUSY particle signatures depend on their decays. The most distinctive is the missing energy and momentum of the undetected LSP (usually assumed to be the lightest neutralino $\tilde{Z}_1$) in all SUSY decay chains with R -parity conservation. At hadron colliders one can only do book-keeping on the missing transverse momentum denoted $\not{p}_T$, where the missing momenta of both LSPs are added vectorially. The LSP momenta and hence the magnitude of $\not{p}_T$ depend on the decay chains.

Fig. 2: MSSM parameter regions accessible to LEP, from Ref. 7. Solid curves surround regions excluded by LEP I data, dot-dashed curves show the potential reach of LEP II, and the dashed curve is the Tevatron CDF limit for $\tan \beta = 2$.

If squarks and gluinos are rather light ($m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{q}} \lesssim 50 \text{ GeV}$), their dominant decay mechanisms are strong decays to each other or decays to the LSP:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{g} \\ \tilde{g} \rightarrow q\tilde{q}\tilde{Z}_1 \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{if } m_{\tilde{g}} < m_{\tilde{q}}, \quad (8)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \tilde{g} \rightarrow q\tilde{q} \\ \tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{Z}_1 \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{if } m_{\tilde{q}} < m_{\tilde{g}}. \quad (9)$$

In these cases the LSPs carry a substantial fraction of the available energy and $\not{p}_T$ is correspondingly large. Assuming such decays and small LSP mass, the present 90% CL experimental bounds from UA1 and UA2 at the CERN $p\bar{p}$ collider ($\sqrt{s} = 640$ GeV) and from CDF at the Tevatron ($\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV) are⁹

	$m_{\tilde{g}}$	$m_{\tilde{q}}$
UA1 (1987)	> 53 GeV	> 45 GeV
UA2 (1990)	> 79	> 74
CDF (1992)	> 141	> 126

The limits rise if the squark and gluino masses are assumed to be comparable.

For heavier gluinos and squarks, many new decay channels are open, such as decays into the heavier gauginos:

$$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{Z}_i \ (i = 1, 2, 3, 4), \ q\bar{q}'\tilde{W}_j \ (j = 1, 2), \ g\tilde{Z}_1, \quad (10)$$

$$\tilde{q}_L \rightarrow q\tilde{Z}_i \ (i = 1, 2, 3, 4), \ q'\tilde{W}_j \ (j = 1, 2), \quad (11)$$

$$\tilde{q}_R \rightarrow q\tilde{Z}_i \ (i = 1, 2, 3, 4). \quad (12)$$

Some decays go via loops (e.g. $\tilde{g} \rightarrow g\tilde{Z}_1$); we have not attempted an exhaustive listing here. Figure 3 shows how gluino-to-heavy-gaugino branching fractions increase with $m_{\tilde{g}}$ in a particular example (with $m_{\tilde{g}} < m_{\tilde{q}}$).¹⁰

Fig. 3. Example of gluino decay branchings versus mass.¹⁰

The heavier gauginos then decay too:

$$\tilde{W}_j \rightarrow Z\tilde{W}_k, W\tilde{Z}_i, H_i^0\tilde{W}_k, H^\pm\tilde{Z}_i, f\bar{f}, \quad (13)$$

$$\tilde{Z}_i \rightarrow Z\tilde{Z}_k, W\tilde{W}_j, H_i^0\tilde{Z}_k, H^\pm\tilde{W}_k, f\bar{f}'. \quad (14)$$

Here it is understood that final W or Z may be off-shell and materialize as fermion-antifermion pairs; also Z may be replaced by γ . In practice, chargino decays are usually dominated by W -exchange transitions; neutralino decays are often dominated by sfermion exchanges because the $\tilde{Z}_2\tilde{Z}_1Z$ coupling is small. To combine the complicated production and cascade possibilities systematically, all these channels have been incorporated in the ISAJET 7.0 Monte Carlo package called ISASUSY.¹¹

These multibranch cascade decays lead to higher-multiplicity final states in which the LSPs $\tilde{Z}_1$ carry a much smaller share of the available energy, so $\not{p}_T$ is smaller and less distinctive, making detection via $\not{p}_T$ more difficult. (Recall that leptonic W or Z decays, τ decays, plus semileptonic b and c decays, all give background events with genuine $\not{p}_T$; measurement uncertainties also contribute fake $\not{p}_T$ backgrounds.) Experimental bounds therefore become weaker when we take account of cascade decays. Figure 4 shows typical CDF 90% CL limits in the $(m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{q}})$ plane; the dashed curves are limits assuming only direct decays (8)–(9), while solid curves are less restrictive limits including cascade decays (10)–(14).

Fig. 4. 1992 CDF limits in the $(m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{q}})$ plane, with or without cascade decays, for a typical choice of parameters.^{8,9}

Cascade decays also present new opportunities for SUSY detection. Same-sign dileptons (SSD) are a very interesting signal,¹² which arises naturally from $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ and $\tilde{g}\tilde{q}$ decays because of the Majorana character of gluinos, with very little background. Figure 5 gives an example. Eqs. (10)–(14) show how a heavy gluino or squark can decay to a chargino $\tilde{W}_j$ and hence, via a real or virtual W , to an isolated charged lepton. If a gluino is present it can decay equally into either sign of chargino and lepton because it is a Majorana fermion. Hence $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ or $\tilde{g}\tilde{q}$ systems can decay to isolated SSD plus jets plus $\cancel{p}_T$. Cascade decays of $\tilde{q}\tilde{q}$ via the heavier neutralinos $\tilde{Z}_i$ offer similar possibilities for SSD, since the $\tilde{Z}_i$ are also Majorana fermions. Cross sections for the Tevatron are illustrated in Fig. 6.

Fig. 5. Example of same-sign dilepton in gluino-pair decay.

Fig. 6. Same-sign dilepton signals at the Tevatron.¹³

Genuinely isolated SSD backgrounds come from the production of WZ or $Wt\bar{t}$ or W^+W^+ (e.g. $uu \rightarrow ddW^+W^+$ by gluon exchange), with cross sections of order α_2^2 or $\alpha_2\alpha_3^2$ or $\alpha_2^2\alpha_3^2$ compared to α_3^2 for gluino pair production, so we expect to control them with suitable cuts. Very large $b\bar{b}$ production gives SSD via semileptonic b -decays plus B - $\bar{B}$ mixing, and also via combined $b \rightarrow c \rightarrow s \ell^+ \nu$ and $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c} \ell^+ \nu$ decays, but both leptons are produced in jets and can be suppressed by stringent isolation criteria. Also $t\bar{t}$ gives SSD via $t \rightarrow b \ell^+ \nu$ and $\bar{t} \rightarrow \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c} \ell^+ \nu$, but the latter lepton is non-isolated. So SSD provide a promising SUSY signature.

The Tevatron can also search for trileptons,^{14,15} arising for example from $W^* \rightarrow \tilde{W}\tilde{Z}_2 \rightarrow (\ell\nu\tilde{Z}_1)(\ell\bar{\ell}\tilde{Z}_1)$. Figure 7 shows predicted trilepton rates at the Tevatron for both the minimal SU(5) and no-scale flipped SU(5) supergravity models;¹⁵ the flipped SU(5) model tends to give the bigger values.

Gluino production rates at SSC/LHC are much higher than at the Tevatron. At $\sqrt{s} = 40$ TeV, the cross section is

$$\sigma(\tilde{g}\tilde{g}) = 10^4, 700, 6 \text{ fb} \quad \text{for } m_{\tilde{g}} = 0.3, 1, 2 \text{ TeV} . \quad (15)$$

Many different SUSY signals have been evaluated, including $\cancel{p}_T + n$ jets, $\cancel{p}_T + \text{SSD}$, $\cancel{p}_T + n$ isolated leptons, $\cancel{p}_T + \text{one isolated lepton} + Z$, $\cancel{p}_T + Z$, $\cancel{p}_T + Z + Z$. SSC signals from $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ production are shown versus $m_{\tilde{g}}$ in Fig. 8 for two scenarios, after various cuts; the labels 3,4,5 refer to numbers of isolated leptons.⁸

Sufficiently heavy gluinos can also decay copiously to t -quarks^{8,16}:

$$\tilde{g} \rightarrow t\bar{t}\tilde{Z}_i, t\bar{b}\tilde{W}^-, b\bar{t}\tilde{W}^+ . \quad (16)$$

Then $t \rightarrow bW$ decay leads to multiple W production. For a gluino of mass 1.5 TeV, the $\tilde{g} \rightarrow W, WW, WWZ, WWWW$ branching fractions are typically of order 30%, 30%,

Fig. 7. Predicted Tevatron trilepton events per 100 pb⁻¹ for minimal SU(5) and no-scale flipped SU(5) supergravity solutions (each represented by a point).¹⁵

Fig. 8. SSC cross sections for various SUSY signals, after cuts.⁸

6%, 6%, respectively. Figure 9 illustrates SSC cross sections for multi- W production via gluino pair decays (assuming $m_{\tilde{g}} < m_{\tilde{q}}$). We see that for $m_{\tilde{g}} \sim 1$ TeV the SUSY rate for $4W$ production can greatly exceed the dominant SM $4t \rightarrow 4W$ mode, offering yet another signal for SUSY.¹⁶

Fig. 9. Typical SSC rates for for $\tilde{g}\tilde{g} \rightarrow \text{multi-}W$ states.¹⁶

To summarize this section:

- (a) Experimental SUSY particle searches have hitherto been based largely on $\not{p}_T$ signals. But for $m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{q}} > 50$ GeV cascade decays become important; they weaken the simple $\not{p}_T$ signals but provide new signals such as same-sign dileptons and trileptons, which will be pursued at the Tevatron.
- (b) For even heavier squarks and gluinos, the cascade decays dominate completely and provide further exotic (multi- W , Z and multi-lepton) signatures, which will be pursued at the SSC and LHC. They would find spectacular events, containing several hard jets from the primary decay plus many hard isolated leptons (10^3 – 10^4 events per year with 3–4 such leptons), sometimes having multiple t and b hadrons in the chain, with little conventional background.
- (c) Gluinos and squarks in the expected mass range will not escape detection.

3 SUSY Higgs Phenomenology

In minimal SUSY, two Higgs doublets H_1 and H_2 are needed to cancel anomalies and at the same time give masses to both up- and down-type quarks.¹⁷ Their vevs are $v_1 = v \cos \beta$ and $v_2 = v \sin \beta$ where $v = 246$ GeV is the SM vev and $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$ parameterizes their ratio ($0 \leq \beta \leq \pi/2$). There are therefore 5 physical scalar states: h and H (neutral CP-even with $m_h < m_H$), A (neutral CP-odd) and $H^\pm$. At tree level the scalar masses and couplings and an h - H mixing angle α are all determined by two parameters, conveniently chosen to be m_A and $\tan \beta$. At tree level the masses obey $m_h \leq M_Z, m_A; m_H \geq M_Z, m_A; m_{H^\pm} \geq M_W, m_A$.

Radiative corrections can be big, however.¹⁸ The most important new parameters entering here are the t and $\tilde{t}$ masses; we neglect for simplicity some other parameters related to squark mixing. One-loop corrections give h and H mass shifts of order $\delta m^2 \sim G_F m_t^4 \ln(m_{\tilde{t}}/m_t)$, arising from incomplete cancellation of t and $\tilde{t}$ loops. The h

and H mass bounds get shifted up and for the typical case $m_t = 150$ GeV, $m_{\tilde{t}} = 1$ TeV (which we usually assume) we get

$$m_h \lesssim 115 \text{ GeV} \lesssim m_H. \quad (17)$$

There are also corrections to cubic hAA , HAA , Hhh couplings, to h - H mixing, and smaller corrections to the $H^\pm$ mass. Figure 10 illustrates the dependence of m_h and m_H on m_A and $\tan\beta$.

Fig. 10. h and H mass contours in the $(m_A, \tan\beta)$ plane for (a) $m_t = 150$ GeV and (b) $m_t = 200$ GeV, with $m_{\tilde{t}} = 1$ TeV.

In the next-to-minimal SUSY model (NMSSM), one Higgs singlet is added¹⁷ giving 7 bosons $h^0, H_1^0, H_2^0, A_1^0, A_2^0, H^\pm$, with 6 parameters at tree level (because there are now more terms in the general scalar potential). This leads to a richer mass spectrum with looser limits. It is instructive to see what happens to the upper bound on the lightest scalar mass m_h , as constraints on the Higgs sector, the gauge sector and fermion sector are progressively relaxed while requiring perturbativity up to scale $\Lambda = 10^{16}$ GeV and a SUSY scale of order $M_{\text{SUSY}} \sim 1$ TeV¹⁹:

within MSSM:	$m_h \leq M_Z$	[tree level]
	$m_h \lesssim 115 \text{ GeV}$	[rad.corr., $m_t = 150 \text{ GeV}$]
	$m_h \lesssim 130 \text{ GeV}$	[rad.corr., any m_t]
beyond MSSM:	$m_h \lesssim 145 \text{ GeV}$	[arbitrary gauge singlets]
	$m_h \lesssim 155 \text{ GeV}$	[arbitrary Higgs sector]
	$m_h \lesssim 180 \text{ GeV}$	[extra matter multiplets]

What are the constraints on the principal parameters m_A and $\tan\beta$?

- (a) Perturbativity. This condition is a bit subjective. Requiring the $tbH^\pm$ couplings to be less than $g_3(M_Z) \simeq 1.2$ gives $m_t/(500 \text{ GeV}) \lesssim \tan\beta \lesssim (500 \text{ GeV})/m_b$.²⁰ Requiring instead (two-loop)/(one-loop) $< 1/4$ in the renormalization group equations (RGE) gives $\tan\beta \lesssim 65$.³
- (b) Proton decay. Some models require $\tan\beta < 3$ – 15 ,⁴ but a more conservative limit is $\tan\beta < 85$.⁵
- (c) SUSY-GUT models^{1,2,3,15,21} find solutions in the range $0.6 \lesssim \tan\beta \lesssim 65$ (with the upper bound from perturbativity).
- (d) At LEP I, all four experiments²² have searched for the processes

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Z^*h, Ah, \quad (18)$$

with $Z^* \rightarrow \ell\ell, \nu\nu, jj$ plus $h, A \rightarrow \tau\tau, jj$ and $h \rightarrow AA$ decay modes. The absence of signals excludes regions of the $(m_A, \tan\beta)$ plane

$$m_h, m_A \gtrsim 20\text{--}45 \text{ GeV (depending on } \tan\beta \text{ for } \tan\beta \gtrsim 1). \quad (19)$$

Null searches for $e^+e^- \rightarrow H^+H^-$ also exclude a region with $\tan\beta < 1$.²³

- (e) Global electroweak analysis with MSSM²⁴ prefers $m_A < \text{a few } 100 \text{ GeV}$, but without much statistical weight.
- (f) To cancel divergences and to remain within the GUT scale, $m_A \lesssim 1\text{--}2 \text{ GeV}$. Combining (a)–(f), there is a general consensus that

$$0.6 \lesssim \tan \beta \lesssim 65, \quad (20)$$

$$20 \text{ GeV} \lesssim m_A \lesssim 1\text{--}2 \text{ TeV}. \quad (21)$$

There is also indirect evidence from various quarters:

- (g) The measured $B \rightarrow \tau \nu X$ branching fraction²⁵ is not far from the SM prediction and constrains possible virtual $H^\pm$ contributions, giving²⁶ $\tan \beta < 0.54 m_{H^\pm} / (1 \text{ GeV})$; this is weaker than Eqs. (20)–(21) however.
- (h) The experimental bound²⁷ $B(b \rightarrow s \gamma) < 5.4 \times 10^{-4}$ is close to the SM prediction, based on $W + t$ loop calculations, setting stringent limits on non-SM contributions. If just $H^\pm + t$ loops are added, an important part of the $(m_A, \tan \beta)$ plane is excluded.²⁸ However, if spartners are relatively light, additional $\tilde{t} + \tilde{W}_i$ loops may contribute significantly with either sign.²⁹ We need more information about the SUSY spectrum to exploit this bound.

Future direct searches for MSSM Higgs bosons rely on future colliders (apart from marginal improvements at LEP I as higher luminosity accumulates). Several groups^{30,31,32,33} have studied the prospects for discovering the different bosons at LEP II and SSC/LHC; their results broadly agree.

LEP II will have higher energy $\sqrt{s} \lesssim 200 \text{ GeV}$, and should be able to discover h through the range $m_h \lesssim 90 \text{ GeV}$, but will not be able to cover the full range of possible m_h . A might be light enough to discover, but H and $H^\pm$ are likely to be too heavy. The parameter sector where both $m_A \gtrsim 90 \text{ GeV}$ and $\tan \beta \gtrsim 5$ will not be accessible — i.e. will give no LEP II Higgs signals for $m_t \sim 150 \text{ GeV}$.

Searches for neutral scalars at SSC and LHC will primarily be analogous to SM Higgs searches (see Figs. 11–13):

- (i) untagged $\gamma\gamma$ signals from $pp \rightarrow (h, H, A) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ via top quark loops;
- (ii) lepton-tagged $\gamma\gamma$ signals from $pp \rightarrow (h, H, A) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ plus associated $t\bar{t}$ or W , with leptons from $t \rightarrow W \rightarrow \ell\nu$ or $W \rightarrow \ell\nu$ decays;
- (iii) “gold-plated” four-lepton signals from $pp \rightarrow (h, H) \rightarrow ZZ$ or $Z^*Z \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^+\ell^-\ell^-$.

Though qualitatively similar to SM signals, these will generally be smaller due to the different couplings that depend on β and α .

Fig. 11. Typical diagram for untagged Higgs $\rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ signals.

Fig. 12. Typical diagrams for lepton-tagged Higgs $\rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ signals.

Fig. 13. Typical diagrams for “gold-plated” four-lepton Higgs signals.

For charged Higgs scalars, the only copious hadroproduction source is top production with $t \rightarrow bH^+$ decay (that requires $m_{H^\pm} < m_t - m_b$). The subsequent $H^+ \rightarrow c\bar{s}, \nu\bar{\tau}$ decays are most readily detected in the $\tau\nu$ channel (favored for $\tan\beta > 1$), with $\tau \rightarrow \pi\nu$ decay (Fig. 14).

Fig. 14. Typical diagram for τ signals from top decay via charged-Higgs modes.

SM t -decays give equal probabilities for e, ν, τ leptons via $t \rightarrow bW \rightarrow b(e, \mu, \tau)\nu$, but the non-standard $t \rightarrow bH^+ \rightarrow b\tau\nu$ leads to characteristic excess of τ . The strategy is to tag one top quark via standard $t \rightarrow bW \rightarrow b\ell\nu$ decay and to study the τ/ℓ ratio in the associated top quark decay ($\ell = e$ or μ).

New non-SM complications must now be taken into account, however, especially for the neutral MSSM Higgs boson signals. New decay channels open in addition to the main SM modes $h, H \rightarrow WW, ZZ$ and $h, H, A \rightarrow t\bar{t}, b\bar{b}, c\bar{c}, \tau\bar{\tau}$ (and also $h, H, A \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ via loops).

- (a) Firstly there are decays to other Higgs scalars, $h \rightarrow AA$, $A \rightarrow Zh$, $H \rightarrow hh$ or AA or AZ ; the regions where these channels are open are shown in Fig. 15, for $m_t = 150$ GeV. In particular $H \rightarrow hh$ is allowed and generally dominates (suppressing all the usual SM signatures) everywhere except in the shaded region or near the line of coupling zeros labelled $f_h = 0$. We already mentioned $h \rightarrow AA$ in passing; it changes the h signals in a small region of the LEP I searches.

Fig. 15. Allowed regions for decays to other Higgses.³³

- (b) Secondly, there are decays to SUSY particles, especially the invisible mode $h \rightarrow \tilde{Z}_1\tilde{Z}_1$; these have usually been ignored but could be significant.³⁴ They could give new signals and they could suppress old signals. Figure 16 shows contours of $B(h \rightarrow \text{SUSY, mostly } \tilde{Z}_1\tilde{Z}_1)$ versus μ and $\tan\beta$, the region excluded by LEP I SUSY searches being shaded (see Section 2); there are small regions where SUSY modes could rise to 70%–90%, severely suppressing standard h signals, but they are within the reach of LEP II SUSY searches (dashed lines) so we shall know. Here we shall mostly ignore SUSY modes, arguing that they may dilute other Higgs signals but will probably not efface them.

Fig. 16. Contours of $B(H \rightarrow \text{SUSY modes})$ versus μ and $\tan\beta$.³⁴

Returning to MSSM Higgs searches at SSC/LHC,^{30,31,32,33} Figs. 17(a) and 17(b) show typical limits of detectability for untagged and lepton-tagged $\gamma\gamma$ signals at SSC, assuming luminosities $\mathcal{L} = 20 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ (two years of running) and $m_t = 150 \text{ GeV}$. Figure 17(c) shows a similar limit for the $H \rightarrow 4\ell$ search (no $h \rightarrow 4\ell$ signal is detectable). Figure 17(d) shows typical limits for detecting the $t \rightarrow H^+ \rightarrow \text{excess } \tau$ signal; here the value of m_t is critical, since only the range $m_{H^+} < m_t - m_b$ can contribute at all. Putting all these discovery regions together with the LEP I and LEP II regions, we see that very considerable coverage of the $(m_A, \tan\beta)$ plane can be expected — but there still remains a small inaccessible region; see Fig. 18. For $m_t = 120 \text{ GeV}$ the inaccessible region is larger, for $m_t = 200 \text{ GeV}$ it is smaller.

Fig. 17. Typical detectability limits for (a) untagged $h, H, A \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, (b) lepton-tagged $h, H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, (c) $H \rightarrow 4\ell$, (d) $H^\pm \rightarrow \tau\nu$ signals at the SSC.³³

Fig. 18. Combined LEP and SSC discovery regions for $m_t = 150 \text{ GeV}$ from Ref. 33; similar results are obtained by other groups.^{30,31,32}

Emphasizing first the positive side, Fig. 19 shows how many of the MSSM scalars $h, H, A, H^\pm$ would be detectable, in various regions of the $(m_A, \tan\beta)$ plane. In many regions two or more different scalars could be discovered, but for large m_A only h would be discoverable; in the latter region, the h couplings all reduce to SM couplings, the other scalars become very heavy and approximately degenerate, and the MSSM essentially behaves like the SM.

Fig. 19. How many MSSM Higgs bosons may be discovered (from Ref. 33).

Turning now to the negative side of Fig. 18, the inaccessible region, Fig. 20 shows that different groups broadly agree on the boundary. This region corresponds to intermediate masses for all Higgses: $m_h \sim 80\text{--}115 \text{ GeV}$, $m_A \sim 100\text{--}160 \text{ GeV}$, $m_H \sim 120\text{--}160 \text{ GeV}$, $m_{H^\pm} \sim 120\text{--}160 \text{ GeV}$. Why are none detectable? What went wrong? It seems we are just unlucky here: the htt and hWW couplings that control $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ become weaker; the Att coupling that controls both A production and two-photon decay gets weak; $H \rightarrow hh$ competition suppresses the H signals; $H^\pm$ is too heavy and $t \rightarrow bH$ is suppressed. Next, is there any indirect way to exclude this inaccessible region? One possibility is to understand and exploit the $B(b \rightarrow s\gamma)$ bound better: see above. We note also that if $m_t = 200 \text{ GeV}$ (instead of 150 GeV as in Fig. 18), the region is much smaller. Another possibility is to derive stronger parameter constraints from SUSY-GUT models, as we now discuss.

Fig. 20. Different groups agree about inaccessible region.

In minimal SUSY-GUT models with $M_{\text{SUSY}} \lesssim 1$ TeV, the RGE have a solution dominated by the infrared fixed point of the top Yukawa coupling λ_t .³⁵ For large m_t , λ_t is plausibly large at the GUT scale M_G , in which case it evolves rapidly toward an infrared fixed point at low mass scales,^{3,21,35,36,37,38} according to the one-loop renormalization group equation

$$\frac{d\lambda_t}{dt} = \frac{\lambda_t}{16\pi^2} \left[-\sum c_i g_i^2 + 6\lambda_t^2 + \lambda_b^2 \right], \quad (22)$$

with $c_1 = 13/15$, $c_2 = 3$, $c_3 = 16/3$. Thus λ_t evolves toward a fixed point close to where the quantity in square brackets in Eq. (22) vanishes. Then the known gauge couplings determine the running mass $m_t(m_t) = \lambda_t(m_t)v \sin \beta / \sqrt{2}$ and hence the pole mass $m_t(\text{pole}) = m_t(m_t) \left[1 + \frac{4}{3\pi} \alpha_s(m_t) \right]$; two-loop evaluations³ give

$$m_t(\text{pole}) \simeq (200 \text{ GeV}) \sin \beta, \quad (23)$$

If $\lambda_t(M_G)$ is below the fixed point, its convergence to the fixed point is more gradual and Eq. (23) does not necessarily apply. But in practice large $\lambda_t(M_G)$ is favored in many SUSY-GUT solutions; large $\lambda_t(M_G)$ facilitates $\lambda_b(M_G) = \lambda_\tau(M_G)$ Yukawa unification³⁹ and allows intricate relationships between fermion masses and mixings. It is therefore interesting to pursue the phenomenological implication of Eq. (23).⁴⁰

Figure 21 shows how $\lambda_t(M_G)$ and $\lambda_b(M_G)$ values relate to $m_t(\text{pole})$ and $\tan \beta$ in SUSY-GUT solutions with Yukawa unification; the lower (upper) shaded branches contains the m_t (m_b) fixed-point solutions. There is a small region at the upper right where both fixed point solutions are simultaneously satisfied. Figure 22 shows that the m_t fixed-point behavior is insensitive to GUT threshold corrections $\lesssim 10\%$ in the λ_b/λ_τ ratio. The sensitivity of the fixed point to threshold corrections is decreased for larger values of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ where the solutions tend to have a stronger fixed point character, as indicated by Eq. (22). The perturbative limits of the Yukawa couplings near their Landau poles are shown in Fig. 22(a) as the dashed lines $\lambda_t^G = 3.3$ and $\lambda_b^G = 3.1$.

Fig. 21: Contours of constant Yukawa couplings $\lambda_i^G = \lambda_i(M_G)$ at the GUT scale in the $(m_t^{\text{pole}}, \tan \beta)$ plane, obtained from solutions to the RGE with $\lambda_\tau^G = \lambda_b^G$ unification imposed. The GUT scale Yukawa coupling contours are close together for large λ^G . The fixed points describe the values of the Yukawa couplings at the electroweak scale for $\lambda_t^G \gtrsim 1$ and $\lambda_b^G \gtrsim 1$.

Fig. 22: RGE results for $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118$ with the boundary condition $m_b(m_b) = 4.25$ GeV. (a) GUT threshold corrections to Yukawa coupling unification. The solutions strongly exhibit a fixed point nature, for threshold corrections $\lesssim 10\%$. Taking a larger supersymmetric threshold M_{SUSY} or increasing $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ moves the curves to the right, so that the fixed point condition becomes stronger. (b) Evolution of the top quark Yukawa coupling for $\tan \beta = 1$. The dashed line indicates $\frac{d\lambda_t}{dt} = 0$ which gives an approximation to the electroweak scale value of m_t with accuracy of order 10%.

There are immediate implications for phenomenology.⁴⁰ If $m_t \lesssim 160$ GeV, Eq. (23) constrains $\tan\beta$ to values near 1, where h is relatively light (recall the tree-level relation $m_h < M_Z |\cos 2\beta|$) and the couplings of h are close to those of a Standard Model Higgs boson. LEP Higgs searches^{22,41} exclude a region of the $(m_A, \tan\beta)$ plane shown in Fig. 23(a): this translates to forbidden regions in $(m_h, \tan\beta)$ in Fig. 23(b). We see that the fixed-point condition predicts $m_t \gtrsim 130$ GeV, $m_h \gtrsim 60$ GeV, $m_A \gtrsim 70$ GeV; correspondingly $m_{H^\pm} \gtrsim 105$ GeV, $m_H \gtrsim 140$ GeV. If in fact $m_t \lesssim 160$ GeV, then $m_h \lesssim 85$ GeV as shown in Fig. 23, and h will be discoverable at LEP II (but none of the other Higgs bosons will). The discovery limits at SSC/LHC (taken here from Ref. 33) are shown in Fig. 24; we see that each of the five Higgs bosons might be discoverable there, but not all at once, and possibly none of them at all.

Fig. 23: m_t fixed-point solution regions allowed by the LEP I data: (a) in the $(m_A, \tan\beta)$ plane, (b) in the $(m_h, \tan\beta)$ plane. The top quark masses are $m_t(\text{pole})$, correlated to $\tan\beta$ by Eq. (23).

Fig. 24: SSC/LHC signal detectability regions, compared with the LEP I allowed region of m_t fixed-point solutions from Fig. 3(a) and the probable reach of LEP II. The top quark masses are $m_t(\text{pole})$.

Finally we may ask what a future e^+e^- collider could do. We have seen that part of the MSSM parameter space is inaccessible to e^+e^- collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV, $\mathcal{L} = 500 \text{ pb}^{-1}$, for $m_t = 150$ GeV and $m_{\tilde{t}} = 1$ TeV. But a possible future linear collider with higher energy and luminosity could in principle cover the full parameter space. It is interesting to know what are the minimum s and $\mathcal{L}$ requirements for complete coverage, for given m_t . This question was answered in Ref. 42, based on the conservative assumption that only the channels $e^+e^- \rightarrow (Zh, Ah, ZH, AH) \rightarrow \tau\tau jj$ would be searched, with no special tagging. The results are shown in Fig. 25. We have estimated that including all $Z \rightarrow \ell\ell, \nu\nu, jj$ and $h, H, A \rightarrow b\bar{b}, \tau\tau$ decay channels plus efficient b -tagging could increase the net signal S by a factor 6 and the net background B by a factor 4, approximately; this would increase the statistical significance $S/\sqrt{B}$ by a factor 3 and hence reduce the luminosity requirement by a factor 9 or so. In this optimistic scenario, the luminosity scale in Fig. 25 would be reduced by an order of magnitude.

Fig. 25. Minimal requirements for a “no-lose” MSSM Higgs search at a future e^+e^- collider based on $\tau\tau jj$ signals alone. Curves of minimal $(\sqrt{s}, \mathcal{L})$ pairings are shown for $m_t = 120, 150, 200$ GeV; the no-lose region for $m_t = 150$ GeV is unshaded.⁴²

To summarize this Section:

- (a) The MSSM Higgs spectrum is richer but in some ways more elusive than the SM case.

- (b) At least one light scalar is expected.
- (c) As $m_A \rightarrow \infty$ this light scalar behaves like the SM scalar while the others become heavy and degenerate.
- (d) LEP I, LEP II and SSC/LHC will give extensive but not quite complete coverage of the MSSM parameter space.
- (e) For some parameter regions, several different scalars are detectable, but usually one or more remain undetectable.
- (f) The $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ bound has the potential to exclude large areas of parameter space (possibly including the inaccessible region) but is presently subject to some uncertainty.
- (g) A higher-energy e^+e^- collider could cover the whole MSSM parameter space, discovering at least the lightest scalar h .
- (h) m_t fixed-point solutions in SUSY-GUT models are theoretically attractive and also strongly constrain the phenomenology; they predict $m_t \gtrsim 130$ GeV; if $m_t \lesssim 160$ GeV, they exclude the inaccessible region and predict that h will be discovered at LEP.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported in part by the University of Wisconsin Research Committee with funds granted by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract no. DE-AC02-76ER00881, and in part by the Texas National Laboratory Research Commission under grant no. RGFY93-221.

References

1. G.G. Ross and R.G. Roberts, Nucl. Phys. **B377**, 571 (1992), and references therein.
2. S. Kelley *et al.*, Texas A&M preprint CTP-TAMU-16-92.
3. V. Barger, M.S. Berger, and P. Ohmann, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1093 (1993), and unpublished calculations.
4. P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, NUB-TH-3056/92; J. Lopez *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B299**, 262 (1993).
5. J. Hisano, H. Murayama, and T. Yanagida, Tohoku preprint TU-400 (1992).
6. H. Baer and X. Tata, FSU-HEP-921222.
7. H. Baer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 1067 (1992).
8. H. Baer, X. Tata, and J. Woodside, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 906 (1990); **D42**, 1568 (1991); **D45**, 142 (1992); H. Baer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 303 (1992).
9. UA1 collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B198**, 261 (1987); UA2 collaboration, *ibid.* **B235**, 363 (1990); CDF collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3439 (1992).
10. H. Baer, V. Barger, D. Karatas, X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 96 (1987).
11. H. Baer, F. Paige, S. Protopopescu, and X. Tata, FSU-HEP-930329.
12. V. Barger, W.-Y. Keung, R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 166 (1985); R. Barnett, J. Gunion, H. Haber, 1988 Snowmass Summer Study, ed. by S. Jensen, World Scientific (1989).
13. H. Baer *et al.*, FSU-HEP-901110, *Proc. 1990 DPF Summer Study at Snowmass*, ed. by E. Berger, World Scientific (1992).

14. P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A2**, 33 (1987); H. Baer and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 2739 (1993).
15. J. L. Lopez et al., Texas A&M preprint CTP-TAMU-76/92.
16. V. Barger, R.J.N. Phillips and A.L. Stange, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 1484 (1992).
17. J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane and S. Dawson, *The Higgs Hunter's Guide*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA (1990).
18. S. P. Li and M. Sher, Phys. Lett. **B140**, 339 (1984); J. F. Gunion and A. Turski, Phys. Rev. **D39**, 2701, **D40**, 2325, 2333 (1989); M. S. Berger, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 225 (1990); Y. Okada *et al.*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **85**, 1 (1991); Phys. Lett. **B262**, 54 (1991); H. Haber and R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1815 (1991); J. Ellis *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B257**, 83 (1991); R. Barbieri *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B258**, 167 (1991); J. Lopez and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B266**, 397 (1991); A. Yamada, Phys. Lett. **B263**, 233 (1991); M. Drees and M. N. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2482 (1992); R. Hempfling, SCIPP-91/39; M. A. Diaz and H. E. Haber, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 4246 (1992); D. M. Pierce, A. Papadopoulos and S. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3678 (1992).
19. T. Moroi and Y. Okada, Phys. Lett. **B295**, 73 (1992); G. L. Kane, C. Kolda and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2686 (1993); W. T. A. ter Veldhuis, Purdue preprint PURD-TH-92-11; J. R. Espinosa and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. **B302**, 51 (1992); T. Elliott, S. F. King and P. L. White, *ibid.* **B305**, 71 (1993); U. Ellwanger, Phys. Lett. **B303**, 271 (1993).
20. V. Barger, J. L. Hewett and R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 3421 (1990).
21. S. Dimopoulos, L. Hall and S. Raby, Phys. Rev. **D45** 4192; **D46** 4793 (1992).
22. ALEPH Collaboration, D. Decamp *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B246**, 306 (1990); **B265**, 475 (1991); DELPHI Collaboration: P. Abreu *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B245**, 276 (1990); Nucl. Phys. **B373**, 3 (1992); L3 Collaboration: B. Adeva *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B251**, 311 (1990); **B283**, 454 (1992); OPAL Collaboration: M. Z. Akrawy *et al.*, Z. Phys. **C49**, 1 (1991).
23. M. A. Diaz and H. E. Haber, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 4246 (1992).
24. J. Ellis, J. L. Fogli and E. Lisi, CERN-TH.6643/92.
25. ALEPH collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B298** 479 (1993).
26. G.J. Isidori, Phys. Lett. **B298** 409 (1993); J. L. Hewett, ANL-HEP-CP-92-125.
27. CLEO collaboration, report to Washington APS meeting April 1993.
28. J. L. Hewett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** 1045 (1993); V. Barger, M. S. Berger and R. J. N. Phillips, *ibid.* **70** 1368 (1993).
29. S. Bertolini *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B353** 591 (1991); R. Barbieri and G. F. Giudice, CERN-TH.6830/1993.
30. H. Baer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 1067 (1992).
31. J. Gunion *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 2040, 2052 (1992); **D47**, 1030 (1993).
32. Z. Kunszt and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. **B46**, 4914 (1992).
33. V. Barger, K. Cheung, R. J. N. Phillips, and A. L. Stange, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 4914 (1992).
34. H. Baer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D47** 1062 (1993).
35. B. Pendleton and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **98B**, 291 (1981); C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. **D24**, 691 (1981).
36. H. Arason, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2933 (1991); Phys. Rev. **D47**, 232 (1993).
37. C. D. Froggatt, I. G. Knowles and R. G. Moorhouse, Phys. Lett. **B249**, 273

- (1990); Phys. Lett. **B298**, 356 (1993).
- 38. M. Carena, S. Pokorski, and C. E. M. Wagner, Munich preprint MPI-Ph/93-10.
 - 39. M. Chanowitz, J. Ellis and M. Gaillard, Nucl. Phys. **B128**, 506 (1977).
 - 40. V. Barger et al., University of Wisconsin-Madison preprint MAD/PH/755.
 - 41. T. Mori, report to Dallas Conference 1992; E. Gross and P. Yepes, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A8**, 407 (1993).
 - 42. V. Barger, K. Cheung, R. J. N. Phillips, and A. L. Stange, Phys. Rev. **D47** 3041 (1993).